



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/590,841 | 08/24/2006 | Janne Mikkola | 915-001.096 | 1434 |
| 4955 | 7590 | 09/04/2009 | | |
| WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5 | | | MAPA, MICHAEL Y | |
| 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 | | | | |
| MONROE, CT 06468 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2617 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/04/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/590,841 | MIKKOLA, JANNE | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Michael Mapa | 2617 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The applicant has amended the following claims:

Claims: 1-7, 9-11 and 18-22 have not been amended.

Claims: 8 and 23-26 have been amended.

Claims: 12-17 have been rejoined and will be
examined in the Office action below.

With regards to the claim objection on claim 15, the applicant has amended the claims to overcome the claim objection. The examiner therefore withdraws the claim objection from the previous office action.

With regards to the 112 and 101 rejections on claims 24-26, the applicant has amended the claims to overcome the 112 and 101 rejections. The examiner therefore withdraws the claim objection from the previous office action.

With regards to the applicant's petition for Review to Withdraw Restriction Requirement, the examiner will regard the petition as a request for reconsideration. The petition is considered persuasive and the finality of the previous Office action is withdrawn on the claims examined as set forth in the previous office action. The corresponding office action will proceed to examine claims 12-17 which was withdrawn from the previous office action.

2. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08/21/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues features wherein a method comprising identifying a data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to a receiving mobile station and in case the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, receiving the data or in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further.

Before addressing the applicant's arguments, the examiner would like to clarify the position taken with respect to the applied art:

Reding discloses a system and method for multiuser selective notification, specifically Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied by sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list, therefore Reding identifies the data transmitting device. Reding continues to disclose having a primary and secondary treatment to the handling of calls as well as having a default treatment. By way of example, Reding

discloses calls to the home phone from a particular contact will ring the home phone and will forward the call only when the called number is not answered within a user specified number of rings. Reding discloses forwarding the call to a user's cellphone as well as disclosing having a default treatment of forwarding the call to a particular mobile number. Therefore, the examiner views the default treatment to be forwarding of the calls to a particular mobile number when the contact calling does not have a specific treatment specified which reads on "in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further" and ringing the home phone when a particular contact is calling and forwarding only when the call is not answered but receiving the call when the call is answered which reads on "in case the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station."

With regards to the applicants arguments that Reding fails to disclose the features of "in case the data is identified as a transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, receiving the data, or in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further", the examiner respectfully disagrees. As is evident in the explanation provided above, Reding discloses having different handling procedures such as a primary and secondary as well as a default handling procedures. In addition, Reding discloses specific examples of when no specific treatment is specified to use the default

treatment of forwarding the calls to a particular number and as such reads on “in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further”. Reding also discloses having a specific treatment for a particular contact such as calls from a particular contact to ring the home phone as well as only forwarding the call when a call is not answered within the user specified number of rings, therefore when the user answers the call before the specified number of rings the call is received, which reads on “in case the data is identified as a transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, receiving the data.”

With regards to the applicant’s arguments that “it is not clear how Reding discloses a receiving terminal which is only able to receive calls from a device which is identified as a transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command to the home phone and Reding does not disclose where it could be interpreted that a call to the home phone from a transmitting terminal is received by the home phone because of a defined divert command”, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the explanation above, Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the calls to a particular number when no treatment is specified as well as disclosing ringing the home phone when the call is from a particular contact and only forwarding the call when the call is not answered within a user specified number of rings, therefore when other contacts are calling the home phone and no specific handling treatment is applied to the contacts, the contacts will be forwarded to a particular number and when a particular

contact with a specified treatment such as ringing the home phone calls, that particular contact will be able to talk to the user via the home phone.

With regards to the applicants arguments that the assertion of the office is clearly incorrect that “the voice network plane includes ISCP SPACE, ISCP intelligent peripherals and SSP and may include a mobile switching center as explicitly stated”. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Reding discloses the ISCP space to store records comprising customer records and how to handle calls directed to the customer and that the voice network plane may include a mobile switching center. The examiner acknowledged in the previous office action that Reding fails to explicitly recite “a mobile switching center” comprising all of the elements of the claim and proceeded to provide an explanation as to how it would have been obvious to incorporate all of the elements into a mobile switching center for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating all the elements into a single apparatus such as a mobile switching center.

With regards to the applicants arguments that the assertion of the office is clearly incorrect and that the “processor stated in paragraph [0040] “CPU 200 provides control and processing function for user terminal 112”. And that the user terminal is in the client plane and not found in the voice network plane which is asserted comprises all the elements cited in the rejection. Reding discloses the ISCP space to store records comprising customer records and how to handle calls directed to the customer and that the voice network plane may include a mobile switching center. The examiner cited paragraph [0040] to show the applicant the functions of a processor. It is well known in the art that a processor is needed in complex machines such as a mobile switching

center. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the invention of Reding would require a processor to facilitate and handle all the call handling operations.

With regards to the applicants arguments that the disposition list is looked at only by the application server and is located in the application service/business logic plane and is clearly not included in the voice network plane as well as the arguments that the instructions to forward calls come from application server which is not part of the voice network plane, the applicant respectfully disagree. Reding discloses the ISCP SPACE to store customer records including information regarding how to handle calls directed to the customer (**Paragraph [0054] of Reding**) and discloses the ISCP SPACE to be on the voice network plane (**Fig. 5 of Reding**). In addition, the examiner has explained that Reding discloses all of the elements of the claim and how it would have been advantageous to incorporate all the elements into a single apparatus.

With regards to the applicants arguments that Reding fails to disclose a voice network plane or any single plane which discloses all of the elements of claim 18. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Reding discloses a voice network which provides features such as call forwarding, caller-ID, three-way calling as well as storing customer records and information on how to handle calls directed to the customer (**Paragraphs [0047] – [0054] of Reding**).

With regards to the applicant arguments that Reding fails to suggest or provide a motivation for incorporating all the elements into a single mobile switching center. The examiner agrees with the applicant. The motivation to combine and incorporate all the elements into a single mobile switching center does not come from Reding but comes

from what is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. By incorporating the elements into a single apparatus such as a mobile switching center, network resources are saved in the way that the cost is lessened since upkeep would only be relegated to a single apparatus and not multiple different ones.

Therefore, the argued limitations read upon the cited references or are written broad such that they read upon the cited references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1, 4, 8, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regards to Claims 1, 4, 12 and 18, the applicant claims “in case the data transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station.” The claims are unclear as to how the a defined call divert command will be received by the mobile device instead of being diverted as to how the claims are stated. For the purpose of examination and the rejection provided below, the examiner will interpret the claims to mean as if the call divert command is to receive the call.

With regards to Claims 1, 4, 12 and 18, the applicant claims “receiving the data or in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station transmitting the data further”. The claims state “transmitting the data further.” It is unclear as to what the applicant means by “transmitting the data further.” For the purpose of the examination and the rejection provided below, the examiner will interpret the “transmitting the data further” as to redirecting the call to another number.

With regards to Claim 8 because the applicant claims “a memory having a transmitting element, identifying element...” It is unclear as to how a memory would have all the elements claimed. For the purpose of examination and the rejection provided below, the examiner will interpret the claims to read as “a memory coupled to a transmitting element, identifying element... ”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 12-17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding).

Regarding claim 1, Reding discloses “A method comprising: identifying a data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to a receiving mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list**). Reding discloses “and in case the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, receiving the data, or in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device, from which there is defined a call divert command to the receiving mobile station, transmitting the data further” (**Paragraph [0121] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore receiving the data when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command, as well as disclosing forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore the transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device and transmitting the data further**).

Regarding claim 2, Reding discloses “A method according to claim 1, wherein the transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station, is identified by a network device before transmitting the data to the receiving mobile station, and the receiving mobile station is selected according to the identified data transmitting device by said network device” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call which is then routed by the network to the SSP and ISCP and the ISCP determining if special handling based on the caller-ID should be applied and wherein a query is sent to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list to retrieve the instructions on how to handle the call such as forwarding to a particular number of a mobile phone, therefore a network device**).

Regarding claim 4, Reding discloses “A system comprising: a transmitter for transmitting data from a transmitting mobile station to a receiving mobile station as a response to a call divert command in the transmitting mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0038] & [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the invention using mobile phones and forwarding the call (transmitting data) to a particular number if the calling party is specified in the disposition list to forward the calls, therefore a transmitter**). Reding discloses “a processor configured to identify a data transmitting device from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0040] & [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the CPU providing the control and processing functions having a processor and receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be**

applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list). Reding discloses “a receiver for receiving data in the receiving mobile station, in case the data transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station, from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore a receiver for receiving the data when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command).**

Reding discloses “and a further transmitter for transmitting data further to a predetermined receiving device, in case the data transmitting mobile station is identified as other than the transmitting mobile station from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a further transmitter in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).**

Regarding claim 6, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein said processor is configured to redefine receiver information of the transmitted data based on predefined receiver information, as a response to identifying the data transmitting device as other than the transmitting mobile station, from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraphs [0040] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default**

handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (predefined receiver) if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a processor configured to redefine receiver information in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).

Regarding claim 7, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein said processor is configured to redefine the receiver information based on data type, according to predetermined instructions, as a response to identifying the data transmitting device as other than the transmitting mobile station from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (Paragraphs [0040] & [0090] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (predefined receiver) if no specific treatment is specified as well as disclosing SMS messages addressed to their home phone number directed to an SMS capable device, therefore a processor configured to redefine receiver information based on data type in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).

Regarding claim 8, Reding discloses “A memory coupled to a transmitting element, identifying element, receiving element and further transmitting elements are a computer program stored thereon for carrying out the method of claim 1” (Paragraph [0125] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the system and method of the invention to be stored on computer readable media. See arguments for claim 1).

Regarding claim 12, Reding discloses “A mobile station comprising a processor” (**Paragraph [0040] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a processor**). Reding discloses “configured to: receive a call divert command that is defined in a transmitting mobile station, so that the mobile station receives data designated to said transmitting mobile station” (**Paragraphs [0116] & [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls from a particular user will ring the home phone and the user electing to only forward the call if the called number is not answered within a user specified number of rings, therefore since the mobile device receives the call divert command for the transmitting when the user doesn’t answer**). Reding discloses “identify a data transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list**). Reding discloses “receive the data, in case the data transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station, from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the mobile station, and transmit data further, in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting mobile station, from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the mobile station” (**Paragraph [0121] & [0116]-[0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone and the user will forward the call if the called number is not answered within a user specified number of rings, therefore receiving the data when the**

transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command such command as letting the home phone ring, as well as disclosing forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore the transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device and transmitting the data further).

Regarding claim 13, Reding discloses “A mobile station according to claim 12, said processor configured to identify a telephone number in a request for establishing a connection received from the data transmitting device as that telephone number from which the call divert is defined” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call which is then routed by the network to the SSP and ISCP and the ISCP determining if special handling based on the caller-ID should be applied and wherein a query is sent to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list to retrieve the instructions on how to handle the call such as forwarding to a particular number of a mobile phone, therefore a network device).**

Regarding claim 14, Reding discloses “A mobile station according to claim 12, said processor configured to establish a connection between a transmitting mobile station transmitting an original request for establishing a connection and a receiving mobile station receiving the request for establishing a connection” (**Paragraph [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the user electing to forward the call only if the called number is not answered within a user specified number of rings, therefore**

if the user answers the call then a connection is established between the transmitting mobile station and the receiving mobile station).

Regarding claim 15, Reding discloses “A mobile station according to claim 12, said processor configured to reroute a request for establishing a connection based on an identified telephone number transmitting the request for establishing a connection”
(Paragraphs [0121] & [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the user having a particular contact ring the home phone and rerouting the call if the called number is not answered within a user specified number of rings).

Regarding claim 16, Reding discloses “A mobile station according to claim 12, said processor configured to receive a message in the mobile station, as a response to identifying a previous data transmitting device as the transmitting mobile station from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the mobile station”
(Paragraph [0120] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving notification on a particular user device for calls from a particular contact).

Regarding claim 17, Reding discloses “A mobile station according to claim 12, said processor configured to redefine the receiving device of a message and a transmitting element for transmitting the message further to a redefined receiving device as a response to identifying a previous data transmitting device as other than the transmitting mobile station from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the mobile station”
(Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses having a default handling treatment when no specific treatment is specified being to forward the call to a particular number such as a mobile

device, therefore it redefines the receiving device of the message and further transmitting the message to a redefined receiving device (particular mobile number) as a response to identifying a previous data transmitting device as other than the transmitting mobile station from which data, according to the call divert command is transmitted to the mobile station (when no specific treatment is found)).

Regarding claim 23, Reding discloses “A memory stored with instructions that, when executed by a computer, perform processing data for transmission as a response to detecting a call divert command” (**Paragraph [0125] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the system and method of the invention to be stored on computer readable media**). Reding discloses “identifying a data transmitting device” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list**). Reding discloses “transmitting data to a receiving mobile station according to the call divert command, in case the data transmitting device is identified as a transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore transmitting data to the receiving mobile station when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command**). Reding discloses “and transmitting data to a predetermined

receiving device, in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station" (**Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a transmitting data to a predetermined receiving device in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 9-11, 18, 20-22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding).

Regarding claim 9, Reding discloses "A system according to claim 4, wherein the system is a mobile communication network" (**Paragraph [0033] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a cellular network**).

Reding fails to explicitly disclose “and that the system is located in a message center or a mobile switching center, or both.”

Reding discloses a voice network plane to include the SSP, ISCP and mobile switching center (**Paragraph [0091] of Reding**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate all the elements into a mobile switching center for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating the elements into a single apparatus such as a mobile switching center.

Regarding claim 10, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein the system is a communication network” (**Paragraph [0033] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a cellular network**).

Reding fails to explicitly disclose “and the system is located in a network gateway bus.”

Reding discloses a voice network plane to include the SSP, ISCP and mobile switching center (**Paragraph [0091] of Reding**) as well as disclosing being connected by a direct connection (**Paragraph [0085] of Reding**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate all the elements into a network gateway bus for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating the elements into a single apparatus such as a network gateway bus.

Regarding claim 11, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein the system is a communication network, and that system is located in a network

terminal device.” The examiner rejects claim 11 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 9).

Regarding claim 18, Reding discloses “a processor configured to: detect a call divert command” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0038] & [0040] & [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the invention comprising a CPU that provides control and processing functions having a processor and using mobile phones and forwarding the call (transmitting data) to a particular number if the calling party is specified in the disposition list to forward the calls, therefore detecting a call divert command**). Reding discloses “identify a data transmitting device from which data is transmitted to a receiving mobile station” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0114] – [0115] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses receiving a call and determining if special handling based on caller-ID should be applied and sending a query to the application server to look up the caller-ID in the disposition list**). Reding discloses “transmit data to the receiving mobile station, in case the data transmitting device is identified as the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station” (**Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore a transmitting element for transmitting the data to the receiving mobile station when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command**). Reding discloses “and transmit data to a predetermined receiving device, in case the data transmitting device is identified as other than the transmitting device from which data, according to

the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station" (**Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number if no specific treatment is specified, therefore a transmitting in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command**).

Reding fails to explicitly disclose "A mobile switching center" comprising all the elements above. However Reding discloses a voice network plane that includes a mobile switching center as well as discloses all the elements stated above (**Paragraph [0091] of Reding**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate all the elements into a mobile switching center for the purpose of saving network resources by consolidating the elements into a single apparatus such as a mobile switching center.

Regarding claim 20, Reding discloses "A mobile switching center according to claim 18, wherein the processor is configured to redefine data receiver information as a response to identifying the data transmitting device as other than the transmitting device from which data, according to the call divert command, is transmitted to the receiving mobile station, and to reroute_transmitted data to a redefined receiving device" (**Paragraphs [0040] & [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (redefined receiving device) if no specific treatment is specified, therefore redefining data receiver information and rerouting transmitted data to a redefined receiving**

device, in the case of the transmitting mobile station is identified as other than a mobile station with a specified call divert command).

Regarding claim 21, Reding discloses "A mobile switching center according to claim 20, wherein said processor is configured to establish an active connection between the other transmitting device and the redefined receiving device" (**Paragraph [0117] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses a default handling treatment of forwarding the call to a particular number (redefined receiving device) if no specific treatment is specified, therefore once the call is forwarded to the particular number and the user answers the call at the particular number an active connection is established).**

Regarding claim 22, Reding discloses "A mobile switching center according to claim 18, wherein said processor is configured to transmit a given data entity to the receiving device" (**Paragraphs [0121] & [0090] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses having the calls (data entity) to their home phone from a particular contact ring the home phone as well as disclosing sms messages (data entity) being sent to an SMS capable device of the users choosing).**

Regarding claim 24, Reding discloses "A memory according to claim 23." The examiner rejects claim 24 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 9).

Regarding claim 25, Reding discloses "A memory according to claim 23." The examiner rejects claim 25 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 10).

Regarding claim 26, Reding discloses "A memory according to claim 23." The examiner rejects claim 26 with the same arguments provided above (see claim 11).

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding) in view of Mooney (US Patent 7363006 herein after referenced as Mooney).

Regarding claim 3, Reding discloses “A method according to claim 1, and according to the identified data transmitting device, the data is received in said receiving mobile station, or it is transmitted further to a predetermined other receiving device”

(Paragraph [0121] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses calls to their home phone from a particular user will ring the home phone, therefore receiving the data in the received mobile station when the transmitting device is identified as the transmitting mobile station with a defined call divert command).

Reding fails to disclose “wherein the transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station, is identified in the receiving mobile station before activating the data in the receiving mobile station.”

In a related field of endeavor, Mooney discloses “wherein the transmitting device, from which data is being transmitted to the receiving mobile station, is identified in the receiving mobile station before activating the data in the receiving mobile station.

(Column 5, Lines 15 – 22 of Mooney, wherein Mooney discloses the gateway cell phone comparing Caller-ID information with respect to an incoming call and determining if any of the terminals listed is allowed to remotely answer, therefore

comparing the Caller-ID information and forwarding the call to the allowed terminals).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate the teachings of Mooney of having the cell phone identify the transmitting mobile station for the purpose of saving network resources by reducing the complexity and the amount of signaling done in the back end.

11. Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reding et al. (US Patent Publication 2004/0156491 herein after referenced as Reding) in view of LaPierre et al. (US Patent 6738466 herein after referenced as LaPierre).

Regarding claim 5, Reding discloses “A system according to claim 4, wherein said processor is configured to identify a device” (**Fig. 8 & Paragraphs [0040] & [0114] – [0115] of Reding**).

Reding fails to disclose “wherein said processor is configured to identify a previous device from which the data was last transmitted.”

In a similar field of endeavor, LaPierre discloses “wherein said processor is configured to identify a previous device from which the data was last transmitted” (**Column 5, Lines 1 – 7 of LaPierre, wherein LaPierre discloses the call identification information including the redirecting number is forwarded to the telephone station and wherein a caller identification unit identifies the number from which the call was redirected**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate the teachings of LaPierre for the purpose of identifying whether an incoming call has been redirected from another number and to which number the call was redirected from (**Column 1, Lines 49 – 53 of LaPierre**).

Regarding claim 19, Reding discloses “A mobile switching center according to claim 18, and for defining the receiving device according to an identified previous transmitter” (**Paragraph [0116] of Reding, wherein Reding discloses the disposition list specifying the calls from a calling party to be forwarded to a particular number**).

Reding fails to disclose “wherein the mobile switching center is able to look up in a network home register information for identifying a previous transmitter of data.”

In a similar field of endeavor, LaPierre discloses “wherein the center is able to look up in a network home register information for identifying a previous transmitter of the data” (**Column 5, Lines 1 – 7 of LaPierre, wherein LaPierre discloses the call identification information including the redirecting number is forwarded to the telephone station and wherein a caller identification unit identifies the number from which the call was redirected, therefore network home register information for identifying a previous transmitter**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Reding to incorporate the teachings of LaPierre for the purpose of identifying whether an incoming call has been redirected from another number and to which number the call was redirected from (**Column 1, Lines 49 – 53 of LaPierre**).

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Mapa whose telephone number is (571)270-5540. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY TO THURSDAY 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571)272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Mapa/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Dwayne D. Bost/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2617

Application/Control Number: 10/590,841
Art Unit: 2617

Page 27